UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,158	03/05/2002	Evan F. Wies	IMM062C	1658

34300 7590 12/19/2011

PATENT DEPARTMENT (51851)
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
1001 WEST FOURTH STREET
WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27101

EXAMINER	
BIAGINI, CHRISTOPHER D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/19/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,158	WIES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER BIAGINI	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 November 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *80-90,92-101 and 103-109* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *80-90,92-101 and 103-109* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the amendment filed November 22, 2011. Claims 80-90, 92-101, and 103-109 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 106-109 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive in light of the amendments. Accordingly, the rejections are withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 80-90, 92-101, and 103-109 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive in light of the amendments. Accordingly, the rejections are withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 80-90 and 95-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosling (US Patent No. 6,618,754) in view of Chen (US Patent No. 5,742,278), and further in view of Doyle (US Patent No. 5,838,906).

Regarding claim 80, Gosling shows a method comprising:

- receiving an input signal from a network (comprising the input signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client on a "network of computers": see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 45-54), the input signal comprising markup embedded in or referenced by a web page (e.g., HTML markup in an "HTML (compound) document": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4), the markup referencing an embedded command (the command comprising a "code fragment": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4);
- extracting the command from the input signal (necessary in order to "run" the code fragment: see col. 11, line 58 to col. 12, line 4); and
- generating an output signal based on the command (e.g., a "visual or audible manifestation (e.g., graphical or sound simulations)": see col. 10, lines 3-7 and col. 11, lines 52-54).

Gosling does not explicitly show:

- that the embedded command is a force feedback command, and
- in response to an interaction, generating the output signal based on the force feedback command.

Chen shows:

- embedded force feedback commands (see col. 6, lines 32-42, showing program code having embedded force feedback commands in the form of API calls); and
- in response to an interaction (e.g., a user interaction: see col. 12, lines 5-18), generating an output signal based on the force feedback command (comprising a force feedback effect: see Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 12-18 and 26-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling with the force feedback functionality taught by Chen in order to provide a more engaging simulation for the user (note that Gosling suggests using the embedded commands for "simulations" at col. 2, lines 13-18 and col. 10, lines 3-7; and that Chen uses force feedback such as a "'rumble' effect...to simulate an earthquake" as described at col. 4, lines 32-35).

Gosling in view of Chen does not explicitly show that the interaction is with a web page.

Doyle shows, in response to an interaction with a web page, generating an output signal (e.g., generating pixmap data upon manipulating a "multidimensional data object" in a "hypermedia document": see col. 9, lines 24-40; col. 9, line 66 to col. 10, line 16; and col. 15, line 63 to col. 16, line 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen to generate output in response to an interaction with a web page as taught by Doyle in order to "provide the user with a better understanding of information presented [in the web page] and to allow the user to accomplish a wider variety of tasks" (see Doyle, col. 6, lines 43-47).

Regarding claim 81, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, and further shows wherein the network comprises the Internet (see Gosling, Fig. 6 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 82, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, and further shows wherein the output signal is operable to cause a manipulandum to output a force (see Chen, col. 3, lines 33-36, as combined above).

Regarding claim 83, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, and further shows wherein the output signal is operable to cause a force to be output in a simulation device (e.g., a system which can simulate a "springy damper" or an earthquake: see Chen, col. 4, lines 32-38, as combined above) comprising a processor (see Chen, col. 3, lines 33-36, as combined above).

Regarding claim 84, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, and further shows wherein the input signal is a first input signal (comprising a first input signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client on a "network of computers": see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 45-54), but does not explicitly show receiving a second input signal from a manipulandum.

Chen shows receiving a second input signal from a manipulandum (sensor signals from a joystick, which indicate its position: see Chen, col. 3, lines 28-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the second input signal taught by Chen in order to provide force feedback directly to the user's input device, thereby creating a more realistic simulation.

Regarding claim 85, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 84 as applied above, and further shows wherein the output signal is further associated with the second input signal (note that the output signal can be programmed to vary according to the position and speed of the joystick: see Chen, col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 8, as combined above).

Regarding claim 86, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the force feedback command comprises a first force feedback command and further comprising:

- receiving the output signal; and
- overriding the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command.

Chen shows wherein the force feedback command comprises a first force feedback command (see col. 4, lines 12-18 and 26-28) and further comprising:

- receiving the output signal (e.g., receiving the signal at DSP 30: see Chen, col. 4, lines 12-20); and
- overriding the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command (e.g., overriding a command that invoked an effect with a command to

cancel the effect or a command to overlap another effect on top of it: see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-36 and col. 10, lines 19-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the output reception and overriding taught by Chen in order to provide developers with more control over the force feedback experience.

Regarding claim 87, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 86 as applied above, and further shows wherein the first force feedback command comprises an authored force feedback command (e.g., "authored" by the programmer who writes the program code: see Chen, col. 3, lines 51-57, as combined above).

Regarding claim 88, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 86 as applied above, and further shows wherein the second force feedback command comprises a generic force feedback command (for example a command to create a basic, built-in effect, which is "generic" because it "may be used to create a wide variety of effects adequate for many different applications," as opposed to a non-generic command, which would be specialized to particular applications: see Chen, col. 5, lines 40-45; col. 9, lines 48-54; and col. 11, lines 24-41, as combined above).

Regarding claim 89, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 86 as applied above, and further shows generating a force feedback effect associated with the second force feedback command (see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-38, as combined above).

Regarding claim 90, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, and further shows receiving the output signal (e.g., receiving the signal at DSP 30: see Chen, col. 4, lines 12-20, as combined above); and generating a force feedback effect (e.g., a force effect such as a rumble: see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-38, as combined above).

Regarding claim 95, Gosling shows a non-transitory computer-readable medium storing instructions causing a processor (at least implicitly disclosed as a necessary component of a computer-implemented system) to:

- receive an input signal from a network (comprising the input signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client on a "network of computers": see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 45-54), the input signal comprising markup embedded in or referenced by a web page (e.g., HTML markup in an "HTML (compound) document": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4), the markup referencing an embedded command (the command comprising a "code fragment": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4);
- extract the command from the input signal (necessary in order to "run" the code fragment: see col. 11, line 58 to col. 12, line 4); and

- generate an output signal based on the command (e.g., a "visual or audible manifestation (e.g., graphical or sound simulations)": see col. 10, lines 3-7 and col. 11, lines 52-54).

Gosling does not explicitly show:

- that the embedded command is a force feedback command, and
- instructions to, in response to an interaction, generate the output signal based on the force feedback command.

Chen shows:

- embedded force feedback commands (see col. 6, lines 32-42, showing program code having embedded force feedback commands in the form of API calls); and
- instructions to, in response to an interaction (e.g., a user interaction: see col. 12, lines 5-18), generate an output signal based on the force feedback command (comprising a force feedback effect: see Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 12-18 and 26-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling with the force feedback functionality taught by Chen in order to provide a more engaging simulation for the user (note that Gosling suggests using the embedded commands for "simulations" at col. 2, lines 13-18 and col. 10, lines 3-7; and that Chen uses force feedback such as a "'rumble' effect...to simulate an earthquake" as described at col. 4, lines 32-35).

Gosling in view of Chen does not explicitly show that the interaction is with a web page.

Doyle shows, in response to an interaction with a web page, generating an output signal (e.g., generating pixmap data upon manipulating a "multidimensional data object" in a

"hypermedia document": see col. 9, lines 24-40; col. 9, line 66 to col. 10, line 16; and col. 15, line 63 to col. 16, line 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen to generate output in response to an interaction with a web page as taught by Doyle in order to "provide the user with a better understanding of information presented [in the web page] and to allow the user to accomplish a wider variety of tasks" (see Doyle, col. 6, lines 43-47).

Regarding claim 96, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 95 as applied above, and further shows wherein the input signal is a first input signal (comprising a first input signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client on a "network of computers": see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 45-54), but does not explicitly show instructions to receive a second input signal from a manipulandum.

Chen shows instructions to receive a second input signal from a manipulandum (sensor signals from a joystick, which indicate its position: see Chen, col. 3, lines 28-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the second input signal taught by Chen in order to provide force feedback directly to the user's input device, thereby creating a more realistic simulation.

Regarding claim 97, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 95 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the force feedback command comprises a first force feedback command and further comprising instructions to:

- receive the output signal; and
- override the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command.

Chen shows wherein the force feedback command comprises a first force feedback command (see col. 4, lines 12-18 and 26-28) and further comprising instructions to:

- receive the output signal (e.g., receiving the signal at DSP 30: see Chen, col. 4, lines 12-20); and
- override the first force feedback command with a second force feedback command (e.g., overriding a command that invoked an effect with a command to cancel the effect or a command to overlap another effect on top of it: see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-36 and col. 10, lines 19-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the output reception and overriding taught by Chen in order to provide developers with more control over the force feedback experience.

Regarding claim 98, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 97 as applied above, and further shows wherein the first force feedback command comprises an

authored force feedback command (e.g., "authored" by the programmer who writes the program code: see Chen, col. 3, lines 51-57, as combined above).

Regarding claim 99, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 97 as applied above, and further shows wherein the second force feedback command comprises a generic force feedback command (for example a command to create a basic, built-in effect, which is "generic" because it "may be used to create a wide variety of effects adequate for many different applications," as opposed to a non-generic command, which would be specialized to particular applications: see Chen, col. 5, lines 40-45; col. 9, lines 48-54; and col. 11, lines 24-41, as combined above).

Regarding claim 100, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 97 as applied above, and further shows instructions to generate a force feedback effect associated with the second force feedback command (see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-38, as combined above).

Regarding claim 101, Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 95 as applied above, and further shows receiving the output signal (e.g., receiving the signal at DSP 30: see Chen, col. 4, lines 12-20, as combined above); and generating a force feedback effect (e.g., a force effect such as a rumble: see Chen, col. 4, lines 28-38, as combined above).

Claims 92-94 and 103-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosling (US Patent No. 6,618,754) in view of Chen (US Patent No. 5,742,278), and further in view of Blumer (US Patent No. 5,732,219).

Regarding claim 92, Gosling shows a method comprising:

- receiving markup embedded in or referenced by a web page (e.g., HTML markup in an "HTML (compound) document": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4; note that the document must be "received" by a server in order to store it at the server: see col. 12, lines 38-48), the markup referencing a command (the command comprising a "code fragment": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4);
- embedding the markup referencing the command in an output signal (comprising the output signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client: see col. 11, lines 49-54); and
- transmitting the output signal to a network (comprising the "network of computers" between Web servers 310 and Web client 320: see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 48-54).

Gosling does not explicitly show that the command is a force feedback command.

Chen shows commands in the form of force feedback commands (see col. 6, lines 32-42, showing program code having embedded force feedback commands in the form of API calls); and

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling with the force feedback functionality taught by Chen in order to

provide a more engaging simulation for the user (note that Gosling suggests using the embedded commands for "simulations" at col. 2, lines 13-18 and col. 10, lines 3-7; and that Chen uses force feedback such as a "'rumble' effect...to simulate an earthquake" as described at col. 4, lines 32-35).

Gosling in view of Chen does not explicitly show that the output signal is transmitted to the network in response to an interaction with the web page.

Blumer shows transmitting an output signal to a network in response to an interaction with a web page (see col. 12, lines 41-45 and 55-60; and col. 15, lines 18-40, describing transmitting an output signal containing a web page in response to editing and saving the web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen to transmit the output signal in response to interaction with the web page as taught by Blumer in order to allow users to edit the web page (see Blumer, col. 11, lines 43-52).

Regarding claim 93, Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein the network comprises the Internet (see Gosling, Fig. 6 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 94, Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein the force feedback command comprises an

authored force feedback command (e.g., "authored" by the programmer who writes the program code: see Chen, col. 3, lines 51-57, as combined above).

Regarding claim 103, Gosling shows a non-transitory computer-readable medium storing instructions to cause a processor (at least implicitly disclosed as a necessary component of a computer-implemented system) to:

- receive markup embedded in or referenced by a web page (e.g., HTML markup in an "HTML (compound) document": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4; note that the document must be "received" by a server in order to store it at the server: see col. 12, lines 38-48), the markup referencing a command (the command comprising a "code fragment": see col. 11, line 64 to col. 12, line 4);
- embed the markup referencing the command in an output signal (comprising the output signal which supplies an HTML document to a Web client: see col. 11, lines 49-54); and
- transmit the output signal to a network (comprising the "network of computers" between Web servers 310 and Web client 320: see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 48-54).

Gosling does not explicitly show that the command is a force feedback command.

Chen shows commands in the form of force feedback commands (see col. 6, lines 32-42, showing program code having embedded force feedback commands in the form of API calls); and

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling with the force feedback functionality taught by Chen in order to

provide a more engaging simulation for the user (note that Gosling suggests using the embedded commands for "simulations" at col. 2, lines 13-18 and col. 10, lines 3-7; and that Chen uses force feedback such as a "'rumble' effect...to simulate an earthquake" as described at col. 4, lines 32-35).

Gosling in view of Chen does not explicitly show that the output signal is transmitted to the network in response to an interaction with the web page.

Blumer shows transmitting an output signal to a network in response to an interaction with a web page (see col. 12, lines 41-45 and 55-60; and col. 15, lines 18-40, describing transmitting an output signal containing a web page in response to editing and saving the web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen to transmit the output signal in response to interaction with the web page as taught by Blumer in order to allow users to edit the web page (see Blumer, col. 11, lines 43-52).

Regarding claim 104, Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 103 as applied above, and further shows wherein the network comprises the Internet (see Gosling, Fig. 6 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 105, Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 103 as applied above, and further shows wherein the force feedback command comprises an

authored force feedback command (e.g., "authored" by the programmer who writes the program code: see Chen, col. 3, lines 51-57, as combined above).

Claims 106 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosling (US Patent No. 6,618,754) in view of Chen (US Patent No. 5,742,278) and Doyle (US Patent No. 5,838,906), and further in view of Mueller (US Patent No. 6,263,442).

Regarding claim 106, the combination of Gosling, Chen, and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 80 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the markup references a java applet or an ActiveX control comprising the force feedback command.

Mueller shows markup referencing a java applet comprising a command (see col. 1, lines 32-61, describing an applet, which is a "program" referenced by an <applet> tag, and note that "an applet…can perform any function which a program written in any other general purpose language (such as C or PL1) can accomplish").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the teachings of Mueller in order to allow the system to support multiple kinds of client computers.

Regarding claim 108, the combination of Gosling, Chen, and Doyle shows the limitations of claim 95 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the markup references a java applet or an ActiveX control comprising the force feedback command.

Mueller shows markup referencing a java applet comprising a command (see col. 1, lines 32-61, describing an applet, which is a "program" referenced by an <applet> tag, and note that "an applet…can perform any function which a program written in any other general purpose language (such as C or PL1) can accomplish").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Doyle with the teachings of Mueller in order to allow the system to support multiple kinds of client computers.

Claims 107 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gosling (US Patent No. 6,618,754) in view of Chen (US Patent No. 5,742,278) and Blumer (US Patent No. 5,732,219), and further in view of Mueller (US Patent No. 6,263,442).

Regarding claim 107, the combination of Gosling, Chen, and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the markup references a java applet or an ActiveX control comprising the force feedback command.

Mueller shows markup referencing a java applet comprising a command (see col. 1, lines 32-61, describing an applet, which is a "program" referenced by an <applet> tag, and note that "an applet…can perform any function which a program written in any other general purpose language (such as C or PL1) can accomplish").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer with the teachings of Mueller in order to allow the system to support multiple kinds of client computers.

Regarding claim 109, the combination of Gosling, Chen, and Blumer shows the limitations of claim 103 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the markup references a java applet or an ActiveX control comprising the force feedback command.

Mueller shows markup referencing a java applet comprising a command (see col. 1, lines 32-61, describing an applet, which is a "program" referenced by an <applet> tag, and note that "an applet…can perform any function which a program written in any other general purpose language (such as C or PL1) can accomplish").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gosling in view of Chen and Blumer with the teachings of Mueller in order to allow the system to support multiple kinds of client computers.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER BIAGINI whose telephone number is (571)272-9743. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2093. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher D. Biagini/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445